

J. GENERAL

1. Comments/Questions Concerning The Need for Change

- We've been monitoring the Energy department since 1985, and specifically at the Hanford Site since 1988. And primarily we do that monitoring through representing workers; scientists, engineers, welders, etc., at the Hanford Site. People who know what's going on try to do something about it, and more often that not find themselves in trouble because of that. We try to help them with that trouble as well as pursue the issues that they raise. So that the public money given to Hanford is better spent, and so the health and safety of the public is better protected and for the workers as well. Taxpayers have spent about \$15 billion in the last decade at the Hanford Site, on the understanding they were spending that for cleanup. But besides the slides I saw earlier by you, Lloyd, very little in the way of real cleanup has happened in the crucial areas.

Your budget target shows a \$232 million shortfall needed for legally required cleanup deadlines. DOE has wasted billions of dollars, ignored the public input, continues to harass and retaliate against whistle blowers, and attempted again and again to restart plutonium, and tritium production at Hanford. It's time for DOE to leave us alone and leave the Hanford Site. I don't want to be entirely negative. You haven't blown up a tank sky high, yet! Thank you for that. Still, it is past time that DOE should pack its bags and leave us the Hanford Site to deal with, so that a publicly accountable manager that is committed not to bombs, but to cleanup can take over. (Tom Carpenter, Director of the West Coast Office, Government Accountability Project, Seattle Public Meeting)

- After these many years, I've come to the conclusion that after many hearings, that we're not being listened to and that we've got to change managers at the Hanford Site if we are going to make any progress. In support of that, I point out that millions of gallons of high level nuclear waste has leaked from the existing Hanford tanks into the ground. For many years Hanford denied that this waste was migrating through the soils and into the groundwater, and in fact harassed and bullied numbers of scientists who attempted to provide the evidence of these leaks reaching the groundwater. And finally, in November 1997, DOE did admit that the waste was in the groundwater. This deadly radioactive waste is a ticking time bomb. Yet, the DOE has not formulated any plan for dealing with this waste, even though it will enter the Columbia river and contaminate Northwest crops, and of course the Salmon, which spawn in the Columbia Reach. (Tom Carpenter, Director of the West Coast Office, Government Accountability Project, Seattle Public Meeting)
- It seems to me that the attitude that you guys are taking is like a company that uses an inferior product and then just says, "Well it's cheaper for us. Maybe we will get sued and maybe we won't, and it's just cheaper for us to take the risk than it is to do it right in the first place." The EPA is going to sue you, or put in sanctions on you, or

some of these citizen groups are going to sue you, and that bar on the chart, the “Consent Decree”, is just going to go up and you’re going to have to siphon off more funds for penalties. (Jim Baldwin, Hanford Watch, Portland Public Meeting)

- Please consider spending our money to put working class folks to work cleaning up this mess. Pay working class folks enough to share the profits with them. There are very few “middle class” folks in the Hanford region. Please look at the history of how the front line workers at Hanford have been treated. Then compare that with how the profits went to share holders in the nuclear industries ruling class, as well as, well paid public servants. The nuclear industry has enough illegitimate profits for the next 20 to 2,000 lifetimes. The DOE has absorbed tons of money already, without producing any reasonable solutions or progress in cleaning up the mess. (Roderick M. Allen, White Salmon, WA)
- It is not every man who, during the course of his life, has an opportunity to do something that will bring goodness to a large number of people; in fact, very few people have this opportunity – even fewer seize it. Mr. Piper, you and your colleagues have this opportunity. (Josh Hanson, Seattle, WA)
- I think DOE has too many voices in its ears and it’s time it left the driver’s seat. Maybe a Non-Government organization or the EPA could settle down to overseeing the job at hand. After all, Hanford is the mother of superfund sites in the Western Hemisphere. (Dan Lichenwald, Goldendale, WA, Spokane Public Meeting)
- DOE needs to get some visionaries in there. Got to create a mission that Congress looks at and says, “My goodness, I understand the risks, I understand the problem, and I don’t have a problem funding you.” We have a surplus of Federal dollars, and yet we are fighting for cleanup money. (Greg de Bruler, Portland Public Meeting)
- To reiterate what a lot of people have said here, the management of Hanford is being done in a less than intelligent way. The way that you manage, the decisions that you make, actually cause suffering. People are actually sick and actually die because of these discussions and this intellectualization. A simple fact is that you’re going to go back and bring this information to people who are going to be key in making decisions that are going to directly affect peoples’ lives. Please do your best to communicate the intensity that we feel here tonight. Thank you. (Danielle Doyle, Seattle Public Meeting)
- DOE has failed as management of the area. They should be fired and replaced with a competent agency with no vested interests. Competent and accountable contractors should replace the existing contractor. (Walther O. Wagner, Seattle, WA)
- Administration of the Hanford facility should be shifted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The USDOE has over the past many years demonstrated that it lacks the correctness and trustworthiness to retain control. If any governmental

agency deserves the accusation of waste abuse, and fraud that agency is USDOE at Hanford. (Al Rasmussen, Seattle, WA)

- One of the reasons our priorities are not being met is because there is a lack of leadership and a lack of vision in the DOE. More dollars for cleanup will mean absolutely nothing without strong, visionary leadership, and that has to be our rallying cry. (Paige Knight, Hanford Watch, Portland Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

The DOE and contractor workforce is committed to effective cleanup of Hanford. A transfer of responsibility for Hanford cleanup to another agency would require an act of Congress. Skills needed for the cleanup mission have been recruited over the years, and an extensive training program has been put in place. Your comments from last year were heard, and as a result, the Office of River Protection (ORP) was created by Congress to help oversee our tank farm initiatives. We believe the implementation of contract reform has helped strengthen our management role.

2. Comments/Questions Concerning the Need to Hold Contractors Responsible

- Enforce contracted cleanup costs by companies; hold them accountable. (Carol Trenga, Seattle, WA)
- The Hanford Reservation has become a symbol of corruption, deceit, and ineptitude. Billions of dollars are spent but no serious progress is made in cleaning up the high level waste, the waste that has leaked and is leaking from them, or the Columbia River where the waste ends up. Until corporations are paid only for useful work accomplished according to specification, there is little sense in spending billions of dollars to do what last years billions have failed to do. (Nancy Rising, President, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)
- Let's stop paying contractors for failing to do the job in a timely fashion and reduce the outrageous overhead costs. I think the incentives of the whole program have been to delay cleanup, because the longer they take, the more money they make. So, I support the notion that we quit paying contractors who drag their feet. Take them to court if they don't meet the deadlines, and have someone who can do the job. (Kay Thode, Seattle Region Grannies, Seattle Public Meeting)
- In light of DOE's claims that it does not have the funding to pay for tank waste cleanup, it seems unconscionable to budget for award fees for tens of millions of dollars to contractors whose ineptitude seems to be the problem where they've missed TPA required milestones and deadlines, and mismanaged facilities at Hanford. Giving away that money to those same parties just seems completely irrational to me. (Hyun Lee, Heart of America, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

We agree we should hold our contractors responsible to perform the work and failure to do so would forfeit their fee. The PHMC is structured to provide for the payment of fee, if DOE-identified performance objectives are achieved. All fee in the PHMC is at risk, depending upon the contractor's success in achieving the specified performance objectives. For the FY 1999 award process, the Hanford Advisory Board was given the opportunity to provide input.

3. Comments/Questions Concerning Support to Whistleblowers

- Instead of protecting the people of the Pacific Northwest from the waste of Hanford, the DOE is protecting Hanford's managers from the public. Employees who blow the whistle on illegal or unsafe practices are attacked with an energy and resourcefulness. Hanford has yet to show investigation and prosecuting persons who are stealing or misusing public money, or whose neglect and incompetence are endangering lives. Peace Action believes Hanford can be cleaned up. This won't happen, however, until major changes are made in the way Hanford conducts its business, until whistle blowers are protected and rewarded, and maybe we can pay for them with the money we're paying the litigates who are against the downwinders. (Nancy Rising, President, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Hanford supports an atmosphere where employees feel at ease to raise safety and other issues. The presidents of the contractors and the RL manager have signed an agreement that embraces the philosophy where employees can raise issues to their managers without fear of retaliation or reprisal. We will continue to work to implement this policy. There are several avenues for employees to use if they feel that their manager has engaged in retaliation or reprisal for raising these issues. We encourage all employees to use these avenues including the Hanford Joint Council, the Department of Labor and the Federal 10 CFR 708 process. We will continue to support the employee's right and obligation to raise these issues without fear of retaliation or reprisal. Confidentiality is given to all issues brought forth to the Employee Concerns Program.

- I would like to ask that you start honoring the whistle blowers, that you start putting your money behind that. I'd like to suggest a one million-dollar fund to be administered by the Hanford Advisory Board, giving a million dollars every year to whistle blowers who come forward and blow the whistle on illegal activities, or unsafe activities at Hanford. You can start by taking the money, as previous speakers suggested, from the funds that are used to defend yourself against people who are saying you are breaking the law. (Fred Miller, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Hanford is spending money to support employees who raise safety and other issues and feel that their manager is engaging in reprisal or retaliation. Hanford supports the Hanford Joint Council, an independent board who works with employees who believe they have been the subject of retaliation or reprisal. Adding another organization to the existing processes would dilute the resources already available to resolve these allegations. The Hanford Joint Council has been very successful in resolving retaliation and reprisal issues raised to them by the employees.

4. Comments/Questions Concerning Downwinders

- Medical research and treatment for downwinders should be funded. These people are among the battlefield victims of the cold war, and they deserve our respect and need our assistance. And I'm here to tell you that there is not a single person that I have talked with that believes that last study that there is no danger or no problem for any of those downwinders. (Nancy Rising, President, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)
- The radioactive releases from Hanford Site have sickened and killed your neighbors in the past, and may do so in the future, yet you continue to deny this past damage and you denied medical monitoring and care for these people who have been hurt. Instead, you have spent nearly \$70 million to law firms in the last ten years to fight these very downwinders. (Tom Carpenter, Director of the West Coast Office, Government Accountability Project, Seattle Public Meeting)
- We lived in Pasco from 1960-1966. Our daughter was born in December 1964. During that interval all of our drinking water came from the Columbia River downstream from Hanford. Since then our daughter was diagnosed with Graves disease and had to have her thyroid destroyed with radioactive iodine 131. There was the potential that her thyroid could become overactive and kill her within an hour. So she had to move out of her home and away from her 3 month old son for 4 days or the radioactivity from the treatment could have killed him. How many other people have been endangered in this way? I would also emphasize that my mother, sister, niece and myself lived in the Tri-Cities during that interval and all have taken synthetic thyroid hormone. This emphasizes to me how important it is that DOE should pay life-saving medical monitoring for Thyroid Disease among the Downwinders. (Sally J. van Niel, [Mr.] Jan van Niel, Mountlake Terrace, WA)
- We are concerned about denying downwinders life-saving medical monitoring for thyroid disease. We urge you to neglect the interest of big business and do what you know is the right thing to do. Request money for life-saving program. Our lives depend on your good judgement. (Dr. and Mrs. Joel Shallit, Seattle, WA)

DOE-RL Response:

In the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Authorization Bill and the Fiscal Year 1999 Energy and Water Development Bill responsibility for health studies was transferred to the Department of Energy's Assistant Secretary for Safety and Health. Funding in the amount of \$12 million was provided for these studies. Based on these directions from Congress this is the extent of what the Department of Energy is authorized to do.

- Stop funding legal fees for corporations defending themselves against citizens – you're using citizen/taxpayers' \$ to do this! (Carol Trenga, Seattle, WA)
- We pay \$4.1 million next year and \$3.37 million in 2001 for the legal bills of the ex-Hanford contractors in the downwinder litigation. This is not a cleanup cost. This needs to be cut out of the cleanup budget. (Gerald Pollet, Heart of America, Portland, Seattle, Spokane Public Meetings)

DOE-RL Response:

The reimbursement of defense costs in the downwinder litigation is based upon the contract provisions of the cost reimbursement contracts that were entered into with the past operators of the Hanford Site. It is unlikely that the Atomic Energy Commission and other predecessor agencies to DOE could have obtained the contractors that were necessary to carry out the nation's nuclear defense activities at Hanford without agreeing to protect the contractors from such claims. These costs are obligations that DOE must fund and are specific to activities at the Hanford Site and therefore are appropriate to include in the funding made available to Hanford by Congress. Since the Environmental Management (EM) program at HQ has been given "landlord" responsibilities at Hanford, EM funding is used for all "landlord" site related expenditures.

- This junk science coming out of DOE like this thyroid study, which basically just tells me that what you're saying is "Well, if you crash into a wall at 90 miles an hour, you're gonna die. If you crash into a wall at 100 miles an hour, you're gonna die". So, what's the sense in having a speed limit, protecting us from radiation leaking into the environment because, according to the study, it doesn't matter. But, you know, the study was done wrong..., but it doesn't seem like this privatization, this discipline of the free market is working very well on this science stuff, because we are not getting a good product. (Jim Baldwin, Hanford Watch, Portland Public Meeting)
- The Downwinder Study is another example of the DOE and financially interested parties, highhanded and cavalier attitude towards public safety. As far back as 1958 it was known that a continuous plume of radioactive material is flowing down the Columbia River. I read about this, as a 12 year old, in *Scientific American*. How

long is the DOE going to give tacit approval of this irresponsible treatment of our environment? Is this acceptable to you? (Roderick M. Allen, White Salmon, WA)

DOE-RL Response:

DOE provided the money to conduct the study through a grant to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). CDC contracted with the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center in Seattle to conduct the study of the effects of releases of Iodine 131. The study was designed, developed and conducted by reputable health care professionals employed by a private entity. DOE did not direct or influence the study. DOE did not see the results of the study until one day before it was released to the public. The study reports the data that was found during the Cancer Center's research. If you would like more information concerning the Hanford Thyroid Disease Study, please call 1-800-638-4837.

5. Comments/Questions Concerning the Public Comment Process

- It does not take me four or five months to respond to any letter I get. There is no justification for it taking four to five months for DOE in responding to our comments. When you tell me that it's expensive to mail out stuff, that's an insulting lie. You are willing to spend money on your Public Relations, that in many cases is indecisive, indecipherable, or worthless. If you can afford to put that information out on the table for us, you can afford to mail me your comments. (Fred Miller, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

We apologize for the delays in responding to last year's comments concerning DOE-RL's budget. This year we put an increased emphasis on responding in to budget comments in a timelier manner. Thus, this document was sent out much earlier. We hope that in the future we will be able to maintain this standard of timeliness.

We believe that there was some misunderstanding concerning what we are willing to mail out to people. A copy of this document was sent to every person who attended one of the public meetings and provided us with their address. In addition this document was sent to everyone who sent in a formal comment.

- I want to reiterate something that's been said here tonight, and you usually get it when you come to Oregon. We really appreciate having the hearings here in Oregon. I think this is the best turnout I've seen here for the budget, which is sort of phenomenal, because most people shy away from the budget like a hornet's nest. But things are getting crucial and this shows we care, and I hope our priorities are reflected and get back to D. C. I mean, we will certainly be doing what we can beyond this, but I don't want to hear from somebody back in D. C. that Oregon didn't have any comments and that we didn't see any need to change anything, and that we

are really happy with the budget. Sometimes when we make comments on things, we hear back from D. C. that, “Oh, but nobody from Oregon opposed the FFTF”. That’s one of the comments we heard from some people, and it’s like, I don’t want to get that kind of news because I’ll go ballistic on that. But I do want to thank people for coming out, for taking your time. I hope you stay involved. Without everybody’s involvement, there is no hope and we have to have the vision. We are the people with the vision, I believe all of us here. And I think some of the Hanford workers have the vision, too. And they have a harder battle to fight, because they’re sometimes fighting bosses or whatever. But you’ve got to hang in there and do what the people say. This is supposed to be a democracy and we aren’t there yet. So, thank you very much for coming out tonight. (Paige Knight, Hanford Watch, Portland Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Comment appreciated, no response required.

- I am shocked and dismayed at DOE’s display of bad faith. For years, I’ve attended meetings/hearings which at their conclusions, promised clean-up of Hanford, closure of Hanford, restoration of the environment. Now, it appears this was never the intention of DOE. (Renee Bergman, Portland, OR)
- The public hearings I attended are a farce. Your employees are going through the motions only. I suspect fear, that the DOE’s intentions are to maintain total disregard for the opinions of the general public. It appears that the DOE is appeasing the profit makers involved in the Hanford mess. (Roderick M. Allen, White Salmon, WA)
- After 14 years of coming to meeting with US DOE and others, and seeing many of the same people and hearing the same issues, I can barely stand to attend. But US DOE just keeps ignoring what people want and what the earth needs. Mr. Piper sat flipping through his materials while others were talking just like US DOE. US DOE has been inept, deceitful, etc., etc. Why bother asking for input when it does no good? Who do you think you're fooling? (Maxine Hines, Portland, OR)

DOE-RL Response:

RL takes exception to the implication public comments and concerns are ignored. We have demonstrated our commitment by continuing to hold public meetings and by incorporating as much as possible your comments and suggestions into our decision making process. We recognize that all DOE decisions will not please all commentors.

- I’d like to know in terms of public participation where is the media and why wasn’t this meeting made public in the press so that we could have had the kind of attendance here tonight that we had last year? (Kay Thode, Seattle Region Grannies, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Before the budget meetings, a press release was sent to all regional and local newspapers to alert the press that these events were taking place. Also, in addition to advertisements in newspapers where the meetings were being held, notices were sent asking newspapers, in regional communities, to include the meeting notice in their “Calendar of Events” section. Additionally, an information video was distributed to local cable t.v. stations to air should they choose to do so. Finally, a fact sheet with information regarding the meetings and items of discussion was sent to a list of approximately 4200 people who have requested that their name be placed on the Hanford cleanup list. Anyone who would like to be added to this mailing list should call 1-800-321-2003.

- I’m from Texas, and am just visiting here. We just had a bunch of Nukes try to mess up Texas out in a little town of Sierra Blanca where they figured a bunch of poor people could be run over and they could..... And you know that our poor people reared up and all that bunch of people down. It can be done!.... Keep fighting them, They can be whipped! (Otis Budd, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Comment noted, no response required.

- The way we started was in 1961, when a few of us realized that nuclear testing is hurting our children. We found out later that it hurts much more. So, the hurt started then. It didn’t start at Hanford.....I hope that Mr. Piper will realize that he should get the information that Mr. Pollett had, just like we got your information, and refer it to the people that are responsible.....And we would like to have the response, then, from your superiors.....And I hope you make a good job reporting to us. (Anci Koppel, Seattle Women Act for Peace, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

DOE-RL attempts to provide Mr. Pollett, and any other citizen, with the information that is requested. Comments received and responses provided are shared with our Headquarters office.

- Budgets presented as pie charts, with all money included, can be interpreted and understood. Meaningless accumulations of numbers obscure what could be a simple, reasonable story. (Richard H. Wagner, Seattle, WA)

DOE-RL Response:

Thank you for your input. We will take this into consideration for future briefings.

- (With respect to letter written to Secretary Richardson) Letters from me, to your predecessor Ms. O'Leary have all been unanswered. I hope you or a staff member of yours, has the interest to respond to my plea for action regarding the Hanford mess. (Roderick M. Allen, White Salmon, WA)

DOE-HQ Response:

The Headquarters correspondence database of incoming mail to the Secretary has been searched, and no correspondence to Secretary O'Leary from Roderick M. Allen was found. However, one letter from Mr. Allen to Secretary Richardson was received on March 10, 1999, subject of this correspondence was FFTF; a response was sent dated April 15, 1999 from William Magwood, Director Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. Another correspondence to the Secretary from Mr. Allen was received on August 13, 1998, subject of this correspondence was cleanup and closing the Hanford Nuclear Reservation; response was sent dated September 10, 1998 from Mark Frei, Acting deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management.

6. Other General Comments/Questions

- DOE and its contractors must keep the skilled employees who work in high-risk facilities and with high-risk materials. The skills, experience, and institutional memory these workers possess are essential for Hanford's safe and efficient cleanup. DOE must ensure these employees have the skills and tools they need and that all Hanford employees go home after a day's work as safe and healthy as they arrived. It is cheaper and faster to keep the workers with those skills than to hire new workers who must acquire them. Institutional memory is vital to mitigate the limits on information caused by the culture of secrecy. (Hanford Advisory Board, Consensus Advice #94)

DOE-RL Response:

We agree skilled employees should be retained as required for all funded work. RL and its contractors are committed to safety and thus, ensure appropriate training is received for all employees.

- Management must carefully consider the risk that any contract awarded for new work may be canceled, incurring substantial liabilities, due to shortfalls in funding and a revision of the budget priority list. New awards for work that is not legally required by the TPA or other legal requirements should be questioned at a time that the site forecasts a compliance gap of \$232 million for FY2001. (Hanford Advisory Board, Consensus Advice #94)

DOE-RL Response:

We agree risks must be considered in awarding our contracts, but we must plan for success and not give up our commitment to cleanup too soon. Yes, we have a gap of \$232M in FY2001 and as our past record has shown, through innovation and perseverance with HQ, Congress and other DOE sites, we hope to be able to whittle that figure down to a manageable level. We do not plan to start significant projects that are not required to support compliance related work.

- The HAB notes with alarm the recent work of the DOE Center for Risk Excellence (CRE) as it may pertain to budget priorities. Any guidance on risk, future use, or exposure scenarios must be built upon extensive public, state, regulator, and tribal nation input. Studies or guidance that have not been developed in this way must not be used in budget formulation, priority setting, or decisions. (Hanford Advisory Board, Consensus Advice #94)

DOE-RL Response:

As DOE-RL continues to develop its policies on risk it will seek input from the HAB and others.

Concerning future uses of the Hanford site, DOE-RL has maintained a continuing dialogue within the region. The Draft Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement and Comprehensive Land Use Plan is currently out for public comment.

- We must face the reality of the budget process. The fate of the funding for the cleanup of Hanford rests in Washington, D.C. with USDOE Headquarters, the Office of Management and Budget, Congress and the President. Those of us most effected by cleanup delays are relegated to await the final allocation and then watch as the legal parties to the Tri-Party Agreement renegotiate cleanup milestones that cannot be met with the new budget restrictions. And since we are not a full party to the Tri-Party Agreement, Oregon has no legal say in how funds allocated by Congress are used to cleanup the Hanford site. That must change. (Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon Office of Energy)

DOE-RL Response:

The signatories to the Tri-Party Agreement are founded on DOE, EPA, and Ecology authorities and responsibilities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and parallel state hazardous waste programs. Recognizing the interests for the State of Oregon, the three signatory Agencies have to the extent reasonably and legally possible attempted to ensure that the Oregon Office of

Energy is provided opportunities to participate in discussions with the Agencies. In so far as the allocation of funds, DOE-RL will continue to provide opportunities to the Oregon Office of Energy and the citizens of Oregon to participate in the decision making process. Both WDOE and DOE have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the State of Oregon outlining these arrangements.

- It is apparent that USDOE Headquarters may not be interested in listening to the concerns of Oregonians. During his October visit to the Hanford site, Energy Secretary Bill Richardson made no effort to meet with representatives from our state. Recently, Secretary Richardson met with eight governors to discuss cleanup issues. Governor Kitzhaber was not included. Secretary Richardson is currently making plans for a national summit on cleanup. Again, Gov. Kitzhaber has not been included in the planning process for the summit. Given USDOE's most recent inability to recognize the needs of our citizens, it appears that Oregon can only be heard if it has legal authority to ensure its citizens are protected. (Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon Office of Energy)

DOE-HQ Response:

Secretary Richardson is currently planning a governors meeting on cleanup for this summer. In the initial planning, the meeting was envisioned for only the eight Governors from the states with large DOE facilities. However, the Secretary is aware that Governor Kitzhaber and other governors, from states adjacent to the eight states are interested in attending the national cleanup summit. The format and participation in this summit is being reviewed.

The Department of Energy is very much interested in listening to the concerns of Oregonians. The EM-HQ recently sent a senior staff member to participate in the bimonthly meeting between DOE and the Oregon Office of Energy to listen and address the concerns of Oregonians.

- Please forward to me all information you have regarding cleanup. What is the range of hourly pay for front line cleanup employees? What is the profit margin for the contractors you use of the cleanup process? I look forward to hearing from you. (Roderick M. Allen, White Salmon, WA)

DOE-RL Response:

In response to the various questions:

- **The hourly pay for our non-supervisory cleanup employees at the Hanford site range anywhere from \$11 - \$40 per hour.**
- **As to your question regarding the profit margin for our contractors, there is not a guaranteed margin. Our contractors make their profit by successfully completing agreed upon performance objectives. The potential for fee earning**

varies but does not exceed 10 percent of the contract value for the prime DOE contractors.

If you would like more information on Hanford cleanup, you can visit us at our Internet Website <http://www.hanford.gov>.

- I've been coming to these meetings for 14 years now, and I have one positive comment, and I have long lost faith that DOE is very honest about what's going on. So, no personal offense to any employees, but it has just been really apparent. But I heard your positive comments about the actual cleanup that has happened the last seven months in the last year and it sounded better than what I usually here. So, I went and confirmed it with Dr. Belsey. He was very positive that there has been a lot of good stuff happen. And I know for me, I get real tired of coming to the meetings and I'm sure everyone else does, too. So, I just wanted to say "Yea" to the things that have happened and maybe you need to blow your own horn about that a little more. (Maxine Hines, Portland Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Thank you for your kind input.

- Today there is no Soviet Union and the best defense against the still potent nuclear arsenal is to energetically pursue threat reduction and phase multilateral abolition of all nuclear weapons. Instead, the DOE is designing and producing new nuclear weapons. (Nancy Rising, President, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-HQ Response:

DOE is not designing or producing new nuclear weapons. In fact, no new weapons have been added to the stockpile for almost 10 years. We have dismantled almost 10,000 weapons in the last 10 years. We are maintaining the safety, security, and reliability of the US nuclear deterrent, which the President has declared a supreme national interest through the Stockpile Stewardship Program.

- I just really would like to say that I enjoyed Paige Leven's comments and I thought despite all the rhetoric you hear from those liberals in Seattle, I just want you to know that we mean well. We really want to see this area safe for our children and grandchildren. And we really do believe that you do too. We know that you wouldn't take jobs in the EPA or the Department of Ecology, or in a nuclear site that's devoted to cleanup, without sharing those same views with us..... We know that bureaucrats aren't these evil people that just want to spend our money and wanting to give money to contractors. But you got to convince us better. (Andy Schauer, Government Accountability Project, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Comment noted, no response required.

- I spoke close to a year ago with an Assistant Secretary of Energy, Vic Reis, whose head of what's called stockpile stewardship which is managing the nuclear weapons not in use. He tried to explain to me that a new facility at Los Alamos was going to solve the problem that they had at the infamous Rocky Flats Plant where there were vast levels of plutonium contamination. He said the problem at Rocky Flats was that they were using machine technology, and they were going to get rid of that technology and use cast technology. The Assistant Secretary was lying and he knew he was lying. The problem there was criminal behavior. Rocky Flats was closed down by a FBI raid. The FBI does not investigate incompatible technologies. The FBI investigates crimes. That sort of criminal behavior, I believe I'm certain, is still going on at other DOE facilities, including Hanford. (Fred Miller, Peace Action in Washington, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-HQ Response:

As part of the Stewardship Program, the DOE is recapturing a pit-production capacity at LANL. This facility will use state-of-the-art production technologies to minimize waste streams.

- We, the undersigned, represent twenty (19) taxing jurisdictions in Benton, Franklin and Grant counties who receive payments in lieu of taxes (PILT) from the Department of Energy (Department) pursuant to three different settlement agreements. These entities include six (6) school districts, three (3) hospital districts, three (2) library districts, two (2) fire districts, three (3) ports, and three (3) counties. These PILT funds are very important to each jurisdiction.

We understand the Department's proposed fiscal year 2000 budget for the Hanford site does not include the annual funding of about \$3.5 million necessary to meet the Department's contractual PILT obligations to these local entities. In its December 9, 1996, settlement agreement with Benton County, the Department agreed "...the Department shall in good faith use its best efforts and take all actions necessary to assure the appropriation of such funds by Congress to the Department for payment to Benton County."

We understand PILT payments to local jurisdictions at the Oakridge Tennessee and Savannah River, Georgia sites are included in the Department's proposed fiscal year 2000 budget yet the Department omitted PILT payments for local jurisdictions at the Hanford site. We call upon you to correct this disparate treatment and probable breach of contract and reinstate PILT funding to the Department's proposed fiscal year 2000 budget for the Hanford site.

As a long-term solution, we further recommend that the Department separate budgeting/funding for PILT payments from the various program budgets. We do not view PILT payments as a program but rather as a cost of the Department being a landlord; these landlord costs are independent of the number and/or funding level of programs at the Hanford site. We urge the Department and Congress to adopt and implement this concept. (Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties)

DOE-RL Response:

As indicated in DOE-RL's letter to the Benton County Commission dated May 5, 1999, we will continue to work with DOE-HQ, Office of Management and Budget as well as Congress to obtain sufficient funds for current PILT payments in FY 2000. It must also be noted that we have included funding for PILT payments within our FY 2001 target.

- I was looking at the Hanford Strategic Plan, and Hanford Mission, and they discuss the legacy waste and how Hanford has become a National Environmental Science and Technology asset performing new missions. And I hope those missions include cleaning up the mess at Hanford and not producing more. (Dr. Carol Trenga, Environmental Toxicologist, Seattle Public Meeting)

DOE-RL Response:

Hanford cleanup is the dominant mission at Hanford, and cleanup activities are dedicated to treating and managing legacy waste. Additionally, at Hanford there is a second, long-term mission in Science and Technology that has been in progress for nearly 35 years, and which is one part of the "national asset" identified in your comment. This mission is conducted at the Department's Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and activities are dedicated to partnering with Hanford contractors to meet cleanup needs, and also contributing to national DOE missions in environmental quality, energy resources, national security, and science and technology.

The nature of scientific research and technology development--particularly where technologies are being developed to treat and solve waste issues--at times does result in small-scale generation of chemical or radioactive waste streams. However, this waste generation is expected and planned for, managed, and monitored by DOE and regulators, such as the Departments of Ecology and Health.

Both current Hanford missions are guided by the same critical success factors: protect worker safety and health, protect public health and the environment, manage Hanford to achieve progress, optimize the Hanford site infrastructure, contribute to economic diversification, and build and strengthen partnerships for progress. In general, it is the whole Hanford site, the physical assets, and the

workforce are the “national asset” that makes Hanford suitable for new missions in addition to our current ones.

- The HAMMER facility includes training of border guards and police, and we are subsidizing it significantly, for non-Hanford cleanup work. (Gerald Pollet, Heart of America, Portland, Seattle, Spokane Public Meetings)

DOE-RL Response:

This is not an accurate conclusion. On the contrary, non-Hanford clients are subsidizing the Hanford cleanup mission. All non-Hanford training, including border guards and police training, that occurs at HAMMER is part of the Work-For-Others and User Facility programs. The laws governing these programs require full-cost recovery from the client for services and use of the facility. HAMMER is in compliance with the law. Furthermore, part of the funds collected from these non-Hanford entities off-set other Hanford costs or reduce the contractor overheads being applied to cleanup.

- We appreciate the opportunity provided to the Hanford Communities to be briefed on the 2001 budget proposal at our meeting on March 26. We also appreciate the opportunity to submit this advice for your consideration as you finalize your budget proposal. (Hanford Communities)

DOE-RL Response:

Thank you for your kind comment.

- Since it was DOE who set up the CBMEDA Catastrophe by approving the way TRIDEC split up the community into a white male section and a minority section, the following is my prospectus for DOE to resolve this DOE/TRIDEC race card debauchery whose resolution possibly will have budget carry over effects on DOE's yearly budgets for the next three plus years as follows:

1) In lieu of DOE/TRIDEC paying to the Minority Community, retroactively, the back fees DOE/TRIDEC owe the "Minority Community" for allowing/approving the past and present abuses, and violations of Title VI., against the Minority Community; DOE/TRIDEC will be required to load Legal Services to the CBMEDA Community to assist in the restructuring of CBMEDA as a DOE CRO, reporting directly to DOE, the same as TRIDEC, giving comparable funding and autonomy to CBMEDA as DOE has extended to TRIDEC the past six years; without DOE requiring "matching" funds, as part of the DOE/CBMEDA CRO AGREEMENT. These and the following requests/retributions may be defined as parts of DOE's/TRIDEC's penance for having short-changed the Hanford Black Minority Community; and for these actions having caused the same Black Minority Community to get far behind TRIDEC, economically to recover, in vowing for community resources/matching funds, etc., to become

"productive." 2) DOE will immediately issue funding comparable to TRIDEC's newly hired manger's benefits and salary package, to pay the newly constructed CRO, CBMEDA Manager, stating posthaste, on a new, three year contract, starting immediately. The presently Acting CBMEDA Executive Director will get first acceptance and/or turn down of this new Management and/or Administrative CBMEDA CRO POSTION, with only the Black Minority Community's In-Put; a phenomenon created by DOE and TRIDEC when they originally divided the community. DOE will absorb the costs of this three year contract in addition to the accompanying three years of Operating costs comparable to what DOE has been funding TRIDEC for the past three years. GAO will be able to inform us of that amount. The new CBMEDA (CRO) will also operate under the same MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET EXEMPTION AS TRIDEC.

Additional questions and/or requests continue on next page:

How were the guideline's Community Comments collected?

How was Congress notified?

How and when was TRIDEC established/structured and by whom?

How were TRIDEC Board Members appointed/structured and by whom?

How was CBMEDA established/structured and buy whom?

How were CBMEDA Board Members appointed/selected and by whom?

Who authored TRIDEC's and CBMEDA's WA State Charters?

Since they (the charters) have such an impact on my life, please mail to me copies.

Why does certain elements of the community (Blacks) have to meet TRIDEC's criteria of approval to even apply to be considered for participation in the 3161 program -- it was Congress and the President who appropriated these community grants?

Why is there a Local DOE? They have no answers, take no responsibility and seem to have very little work to do -- They would have me to believe TRIDEC is "in charge."

Please do not allocate funds for a new DOE Manager. Promote the Deputy Manager.

Requests: Alternative to promoting the Hanford DOE Deputy Manager: Ask the President to recall all DOE Upper Level Managers back to WA, DC for dismissal and use their salaries toward Clean-up -- neither Management and Budgets nor Congressional approval would be needed. Their salaries are already in the Operation Budget. Those Salaries plus those managers' travel, TRIDEC's travel, WSU's travel and PNNL's travel will probably more than supply the \$53 million plus dollars to keep Hanford Clean-up going. Telephone prefixes indicate a fair amount of DOE Employees are already scattered among it's subcontractors. Work out a reuse plan with Federal Property Stewards and turn the Federal Building over to the City of Richland. DOE probably owes the City of Richland more PILT Money than the Federal Building is worth.

CBNEDA (Columbia Basin Minority Economic Development Association) was/is not designated as a CRO, by DOE Headquarters, but as a "project" entity as defined in DOE Headquarters' written guidance -- subordinate to TRIDEC, requiring TRIDEC to be as specific in defining purchased project(s) services for CBMEDA as the Tri-Party was required to do for DOE about Hanford Clean-up; including giving to CBMEDA its share of 3161 funds. From what I understand the small number of total jobs created by WSU, AG, PNNL and TRIDEC and others, and their ratio of funding amounts to CBMEDA; makes CBMEDA more productive than they. I request a copy of the TRIDEC/CBMEDA Project Agreement. Question: Why is CBMEDA measured by the same production yard stick as TRIDEC who is getting funding from DOE, the State, Counties and the Cities plus expensive Memberships, and is lead by expensive management, and PNNL and others with diverse funding, thank tanks and managers? (Bernice C. Mitchell, Richland, WA)

DOE-RL Response:

Thank you for your input. We understand the Office of Worker and Economic Transition has been working with you on similar issues.